

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 24TH JANUARY 2007 / 4TH MAGHA 1928

WP(C).No. 1894 of 2007(A)

PETITIONER:

M.SADANANDAN
PANNIMATTATHIL HOUSE
NAIKUTTY POST, SULTHAN BATHERY
WYANAD DISTRICT

BY ADV. SRI.AJAYA KUMAR. G
SRI.MATHAI M PAIKADAY(SR.)

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE SECRETARY
NIRMITHI KENDRA WYANADU
MANANTHAVADI P.O.,
WYNADU DISTRICT
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR
WYNADAU, CHIRMAN
NIRMITHU KENDRA, WYNADU
3. THE PROJECT ENGINEER
NIRMITHI KENDRA, WAYANADU
PANAMARAMP.O., WYNADU DISTRICT
4. THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
HOUSING DEPARTMENT
SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

R2 TO R4 BY GOVT. PLEADER MR. BIJOY CHANDRAN.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 24/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J.

WP(C)No. 1894 OF 2007

Dated this the 24th January, 2007.

JUDGMENT

In Ext.P5 judgment wherein the petitioner is the appellant, a Division Bench of this Court while rejecting the claim of the petitioner for reinstating him in service in the Nirmithi Kendra at Wayanad, of which the first respondent is the Secretary, it was made clear that if the appellant makes a representation for future appointment in the Nirmithi Kendra, the same will be considered in accordance with the rules applicable. The Division Bench rendered the judgment on 31.7.2000. On 30.12.2006, it appears that, he filed Ext.P7 representation before the Chairman and District Collector, Nirmithi Kendra. The petitioner wants a direction to the Nirmithi Kendra, Wayanad to consider Ext.P7 representation. As already noticed, the Division Bench while disposing of the writ appeal had made it clear that the representation filed by the petitioner shall be considered in accordance with the rules. Hence, there is no necessity to superimpose one more direction in the same lines and in respect of the very

same subject matter. The relief sought for, is unnecessary for reasons stated above. Hence dismissed.

K.K.DENESAN
Judge

jj